The Shakespeare Newsletter

VOL. II, No. 6 *"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."* Sept., 1952

ANTIOCH FESTIVAL MAKES DRAMATIC HISTORY

Panoramic Cycle Presented on Open-air Platform Stage

YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO.—The fascinating spectacle of English history, with its pageantry, patriotism, tragedy, and comedy, was presented in eight successive performances on the campus of Antioch College from August 26 to 31 and again from Sept. 2 to 7. The histories thus presented in a *Grand Repertoire* climaxed eight weeks of regular repertory in which Shakespeare's ten histories (with the three parts of *Henry VI* combined into one play) were performed with a new play being added to the repertory each week. This is the first time in dramatic history that the cycle was so presented. More than 13,000 local and visiting playgoers saw the 67 Shakespeare performances.

Originator and guiding genius of the Antioch Area Theatre Festival was Arthur Lithgow who directed five of the plays and performed very ably in the roles of Bolingbroke, Henry IV, the Chorus in Henry V, Henry VIII, as well as in other minor roles. Meredith Dallas directed the three remaining plays (*RII, HV,* and *HVIII*), and acted a sympathetic Richard II, a fiery Hotspur, a cooperative Buckingham to Richard III, and in lesser parts. Paul Treichler is Director of Drama at the College.

The cast was a mixture of professional and amateur actors who performed with varying abilities. The versatility of Allan Rich served for characterizations of King John, Bardolph, the Duke of York, and later Richard III. David Hooks (who might pass as a double for Sir Laurence Olivier) presented admirable interpretations of Faulconbridge, Prince Hal, and Henry V. Arthur Oshlag and Dayne Hewlett were also cast in major roles with the former most successful as John of Gaunt, Falstaff, and Pandulph, and the latter best cast as the King of France in *KJ*, and as Mowbray in *RII*. Chatillon (*KJ*) and King Henry VI were the most striking roles performed by David Gold. Most talented of the non-professional actors was Ellis Rabb who displayed his art as the Dauphin (*KJ*), Duke of York (*RII*), an excellent Shallow (*2HIV*), and a remarkable Wolsey (*HVIII*). Of the female parts, Edythe Hartt was most effective as the cursing Queen in *RIII*; Dorothy Laming turned in fine performances as Constance (*KJ*), Elinor (*RII*), the Duchess of Gloucester (*HVI*), and as Catherine Parr in *HVIII*, and Frances Oliver Loud displayed her versatility in such varied roles as Lady Faulconbridge (*KJ*), Duchess of York (*RII*) and Mistress Quickly (*HIV*). Allyn Moss was a wonderful, brazen Doll Tearsheet, and Jackie Feldenkreis made a beautiful Anne Bullen.

The plays were presented on an Elizabethan type stage designed by Budd Steinhilber, built over the steps of the 99 year old Main Building. Shrubbery, ivy, and turreted towers were sufficient setting for the plays. An upper stage, inner stage, stairs, and stair landings provided numerous acting areas with curtains sometimes used to hide the inner and upper areas. The principle of continuous staging was utilized but there was no attempt to use the device for every scene. The true effectiveness of Elizabethan staging was emphasized when a rained-out performance was presented on the indoor proscenium stage with only one level for action. The actors expressed the opinion that they no longer cared to act Shakespeare behind a proscenium arch which separated them from intimate contact with the audience.

The spectator was made to realize the march of history and the growth of democracy in the continued struggle in which England was a greater hero than any individual character.

Commenting on his experience, Arthur Lithgow told *SNL* that:

> By mounting the plays on a simple, multi-level platform stage, by designing basic period costumes, and by reducing stage properties to essentials only, we were able to free the actor and thereby give the maximum level of interpretation to the play script with an unforeseen directness of communication. Our experience this summer reinforces our belief that platform staging with a continuous flow of action in the Elizabethan manner is the most aesthetically congenial to Shakespeare's plays.

At its next Festival the Antioch Area Theatre will present the problem plays.

Summer Theatres Increase Shakespeare Offerings

At least thirty summer theatres gave their patrons a taste of Shakespeare last summer and presented a varied assortment of plays. Eighteen theatres billed Cole Porter's *Kiss Me Kate* (based on *The Taming of the Shrew*) while two theatres presented the original play. In addition to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* which was shown at three theatres, and *The Tempest* which was shown at two, *Macbeth, Othello, Julius Caesar, Twelfth Night,* and *The Merchant of Venice* were each presented by at least one summer theatre. In addition to these, the Adelphi College Little Theatre presented "Scenes from Shakespeare." These figures, undoubtedly incomplete, are supplementary to the regular Festivals mentioned elsewhere on this page.

Rice Playhouse

One of the most interesting of the productions was Basil Langton's *Tempest* presented at the Rice Playhouse, Martha's Vineyard, Mass. Frederick Kiesler provided an abstract setting in which the various planes and sectors of the stage design represented various parts of the island. There was no curtain and no pause in the action. Production of the play marked the 350th anniversary of the discovery of the island of Martha's Vineyard by Bartholomew Gosnold who was in the service of the Earl of Southampton. Some believe that the report of his discovery was used by Shakespeare for atmospheric details in this play.

Group 20 Players

Another interesting production was Oxford born Allison Ridley's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* which was presented on a triple outdoor stage by the Group 20 Players at Avon, Conn. One set was used for the rather classic court, a second farther forward was for the rustics, and a third in the distance for the fairy portions. The court processions were inspired by Max Reinhardt and the fairy train scenes duplicated as nearly as was possible the Arthur Rackham illustrations of the play.

6th Annual Shakespeare Festival at Camden Hills, Maine

Prof. Herschel L. Bricker of the University of Maine staged his sixth annual Festival in the famed outdoor Camden Garden Theatre—reputed to be one of the most beautiful in America—last July 29 to Aug. 3. This year's productions were *The Taming of the Shrew* directed by Rita Bates and *Henry VIII* directed by Jack Reed. The stage has multiple levels of turfed area and flagstone terraces. The company consists of professionals and amateurs who come to the Camden Hills Theatre—which is actually a school founded by Prof. Bricker six years ago—to continue undergraduate and advanced study of the drama.

Details of the Shakespeare Festivals at San Diego, California; Ashland, Oregon; and Stratford-on-Avon will be reported in the next issue.

Will Wonders Never Cease?

Late last Spring your editor received a phone call from a man who identified himself as Calvin Hoffman. He had heard of *SNL* and wanted to have it. He was a Shakespearean, he said, who had some ideas, and would like to talk to us if we could get out to Rockaway some time. We sent *SNL* but our reportorial instincts must have been dormant at the time because we missed a "scoop."

On August 27 Mr. Hoffman was in London announcing to the world that he had come to find *all* the lost manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays in the foundations of Scadbury Park Hall, Kent. But that is not all! Scadbury Park was the residence of Sir Thomas Walsingham, Marlowe's protector. When Marlowe was on the point of being arrested for atheism, says Hoffman, Sir Thomas concocted the *ruse* which announced that Marlowe had been murdered at Deptford on May 30, 1593. Then the safely concealed Marlowe wrote more plays and poems which were given to the world as Shakespeare's.

We, personally, would move every stone at Scadbury to find such manuscripts, but somehow we (and our friends on page 31) have a feeling that they won't be there.

However, when Mr. Hoffman gets back to New York we are certainly going to avail ourselves of a too-long-procrastinated visit.

The Shakespeare Newsletter
Published at 749 Franklin D. Roosevelt Dr., N.Y. 9
Editor & Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Department of English
Brooklyn College, School of General Studies
Brooklyn 10, N. Y.
Six issues annually — September through May
Annual Subscription $1.00

Vol. II, No. 6 Sept., 1952

Antioch College and the American Shakespeare Festival

The dramatic success of the Shakespeare Festival at Antioch College has set a milestone in American theatrical history. The Festival was the longest ever attempted in America and the most successful in that its *Grand Repertoires* permitted a culturally significant and intellectually satisfying conception of Shakespeare's art and mind in addition to the usual entertainment derived from the Poet's stimulating characterizations.

Setting aside the two great heroes of the Festival, Shakespeare and England, and the company that worked so hard to make the plays live, the true hero was Arthur Lithgow. At the age of 35, Lithgow is producer and director, actor and teacher. He felt that a summer audience did not have to have madwomen, blithe spirts, and happy times. And in translating this feeling to effective drama be brought to the Antioch campus a renown that only the universally loved Shakespeare can bring. From Washington, Alabama, Vermont, Kansas, and points between they came. One impecunious bardolatrist brought a sleeping bag and slept on the campus; a New Jersey fan came back several times. Such is the magnetism of Shakespeare!

Additional proof that the Antioch Festival at Yellow Springs, Ohio, can become permanent is Angus Bowmer's Oregon Festival now in its 12th year, Camden Hills in its 6th, and San Diego in its 4th. In addition there are the Hofstra and University of Miami Birthday Festivals which will have their 4th and 3rd anniversaries in 1953. And soon we may have more summer Shakespeare at Lawrence Langner's Westport, Conn., Globe, and at Stratford, Ontario, in Canada. We are pleased, too, that the trend toward Elizabethan staging was continued and strengthened this summer as never before.

The Antioch Area Theatre follows a noble tradition. Goodluck and Godspeed.

The Shakespeare Newsletter
749 Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive, N.Y. 9, N.Y.
Kindly enroll me as a subscriber to the *SNL* for....years at $1.00 per annum.
Check here if a renewal ☐
Name .....
Address .....
.....
Checks should be made payable to Louis Marder. Subscribers in the United Kingdom may send 9 shillings to *SNL's* London agent:
William Dawson & Sons, Canon House, Macklin St. London, W.C.2, England

The Itinerant Scholar

English Institute at Columbia

At the English Institute which held its 11th session at Columbia University from Sept. 9-12 four papers on *Troilus & Cressida* were presented in honor of the 350th Anniversary of the writing of the play. Abbie Findlay Potts of Rockford College presided. About 160 attended the Institute of which Edward Hubler of Princeton is President and Alan S. Downer, also of Princeton, Secretary. Abstracts written by the authors follow.

AN ARCHETYPAL PERFORMANCE OF THE PLAY: THE PRODUCER AT WORK

Abbie Findlay Potts, Rockford College

With acted illustrations from the text [scenes were later performed on the platform by Institute members] the speaker set forth the procedure of a director who must interpret a play of 1602 for an audience of 1952. Using the term "modal archetypes" to signify those "psychic residua" (Yung) in the collective soul which record its efforts to deal with, master, or shape its experience, the interpreter finds in this play the following ectypal action: two "amorous" young warriors the "womanish" Troilus and the "effeminate" Achilles, both slackers and AWOL, must-be-brought-back-into-the-conflict, so that these "sharp wars" on the plains of Troy may be ended. Within this ectypal action the archetypal action is as follows: what is slack must be made taut, what is flabby must-be-made firm, what is "weak" must-be-made "strong." To this end there are several modal archetypes which assist (1) in the restoration of emotional balance for Troilus; (2) in the establishment of focus for Cressida; (3) through the deteriorative influence of Helen on Trojan society, in the treasonous actions of Pandarus, Paris, and Troilus and the weakening of Hector's honor; and (4) through the psychoanalytic treatment of Thersites and the psychosynthetic treatment of Ulysses, in the unification of the Greek host.

The formal mode in which the production will be conceived is an oscillatory one. Our attention given to opposite phenomena is shifted successively in such a way as to outline a wave-form resembling the oscillations on a smoked cylindrical drum. We are not only aware of a continuous but alternating duplicity; we join our forces with the fortunes of the slackers and schismatics of the play to help the dramatist promote their—and our—recovery. For us as for them the archetypal experience at last pulsates pleasurably in art, as long ago before Troy was built it pulsated insecurely in organic life.

AN AUDIENCE FOR THE PLAY, THEN AND NOW

Mark Eccles, University of Wisconsin

The unusual nature of *Troilus and Cressida* supports the current view that it may have been intended, not for Shakespeare's usual audience, but for a special occasion at one of the Inns of Court. Leslie Hotson may well be right in his conjecture that the play was written for the Middle Temple, though there is no need to accept his identification of the play with *Love's Labour's Won* or his opinion that the play was acted by amateurs. Since the Middle Temple audience had enjoyed *Twelfth Night* in February, 1602, it is possible that the society commissioned Shakespeare to write a new play for one of its grand feasts in the following winter. The law students would have had a keen interest in the play's satire and in the debates on faction and on honor. John Marston and John Davies of the Middle Temple were among the chief satirists of contemporary society, and John Hoskins and Richard Martin gave Jonson strong support for his critical comedy and took leading roles in the Christmas revels at the Middle Temple.

Troilus and Cressida seems to be aimed at an audience of young intellectuals, and the best equivalent today for the Inns-of-Court men would probably be an audience in a university theater. A modern producer of the play should emphasize the clash of ideas and the psychological conflicts within Troilus, and bring out the theme of the city falling from within through overconfidence. To present the play in modern dress will help the audience to see the play as one that transcends time and is as as significant for our own age as for Shakespeare's.

TROILUS & CRESSIDA AS ONE OF A KIND

Andrew Bongiorno, Oberlin College

An analysis of the action of *Troilus and Cressida* in the light of Aristotelian concepts of the drama shows that the play cannot be called a tragedy because the agents who possess a certain nobility—Hector, Troilus, and Ulysses—do not otherwise conform to the pattern of the tragic agent in Greek tragedy. Neither can it be called a comedy, since its double ending reverses the usual double ending in comedy, being disaster for the good and good fortune for the evil. The play contains the elements and produces the effect of Juvenalean satire. Juvenalean satire is a compound of three elements: the affirmation of an inflexible moral law by following which men may achieve virtue and all the rewards of virtue, the historical examples of men who have lived the good life and enjoyed its rewards, and the portrayal of ubiquitous and triumphant evil in the contemporary world. In *Troilus and Cressida* the moral laws expounded by Ulysses and by Hector are friendly to the good; these moral laws are successfully flouted by the unjust persons in the play; the harsh and even lurid tone of Juvenalean satire is supplied by Thersites. On the other hand the scene in which Hector forgoes a victory over Ajax because he will not stain his sword with a kinsman's blood and the ensuing scene of high chivalry in which the Greek lords pay generous tribute to Hector's greatness, both represent men acting in accordance with the moral law and serve the function that the portrayal of the good men of a former age serves in Juvenal's satires. To recognize this is not to affirm that Shakespeare intended the play to be a Juvenalean satire.

South Central MLA

The following paper was delivered at the South Central Modern Language Assn. meeting last fall at Louisiana State U. when Maj. Jackson was on the staff of the University of Arkansas.

THE USE OF THE FIVE-ACT FORMULA IN *RICHARD II* AND *TWELFTH NIGHT*

Maj. James L. Jackson, Maxwell Field, Ala.

The Elizabethan five-act formula, recovered by Prof. T. W. Baldwin, is a plan of climaxes or narrative steps widely used by Renaissance English dramatists. In *Richard II*, Shakespeare uses concentrated plot which fits the formula well: the return of Bolingbroke is the height of *protasis* (preparation); the capture of Richard is the height of *epitasis* (height of turbation), which is carried on in Act IV with his deposition; and Richard's death in V is the *catastrophe* or final outcome.

Twelfth Night is a play of two love-triangles; the first act shows us a conventional triangle and Act II completes the preparatory stage by adding Sebastian. Parts of Acts II and III are padded with sub-plot action, and the height of *epitasis* comes in the marriage of Olivia and Sebastian in Act IV. The main plot then works out in Act V with the marriage of Orsino and Viola. In these two plays as in his others, Shakespeare used the conventional formula, adapted to his needs, as the basis for the distribution of the cause-and-effect actions and the climaxes of his main plots.

An Introduction to Shakespeare
Key Edition
Hardin Craig
The Eight Plays and Selected Sonnets presented in this edition offer an excellent coverage of Shakespeare for the introductory course or for the course where Shakespeare is one of several authors studied.
Of course, Dr. Craig's fine scholarship is evident in this compact, economical text.
752 pages $2.50 list
SCOTT, FORESMAN & COMPANY
Chicago • New York • Atlanta • Dallas
San Francisco

CANADIAN STRATFORD

Construction of a large Elizabethan theatre for the production of Shakespeare's plays in an annual Festival is being considered at Stratford, Ontario. Tyrone Guthrie flew to Canada in mid-July to consult with the backers of the project.

If and when the plans materialize, outdoor productions with internationally famous guest-stars are expected to equal the productions put on by the sister city in England and make the town a center of Shakespearean activity in Canada. Suitable accommodations will be built to house visiting tourists.

The sister cities have developed strong bonds in recent years. Each town has its Avon, each has a Shakespeare Garden, and building in the old Stratford manner is encouraged. The five Wards in town are named Avon, Falstaff, Hamlet, Romeo, and Shakespeare. High Schools are similarly named with the addition of Anne Hathaway and Juliet. There is also a movement afoot to build a replica of Anne Hathaway's cottage.

The "civic promotion angle" which will no doubt encourage investors in the project is being overlooked by Mr. Guthrie who is mainly concerned with the dramatic possibilities involved.

THE EARL OF SOUTHAMPTON

Students of Shakespeare often hesitate over the name of Shakespeare's patron, Henry Wriothesley. Many different pronunciations of the last name are given by various dictionaries and encyclopedias, though a number of them cannily avoid the problem by giving under *Wriothesley* a reference to *Southampton,* and there supplying the pronunciation of *Southampton,* but not of *Wriothesley. Mackey's Pronunciation of* 10,000 *Proper Names* gives it as *rots' li* or *rot' es li; Jones's English Prnouncing Dictionary* makes it *rotes' li; Mawson's International Book of Names* offers *ry 'oths li* or *rok' li;* and *Webster's Biographical Dictionary* observes that the name was probably pronounced *riz' li.* If this last pronunciation is correct, it might be remembered thus:

A handsome young noble named Wriothesley
Had a friend who was greying and griothesley,
And he loved the old man,
Though soon be began
To love his Dark Lady more biothesley.

N. B. Allen

Again Available!

SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGIC HEROES

by Lily B. Campbell

Reissued with 48 additional pages including appendices of Bradley's Interpretation of Shakespearean Tragedy

330 pp. Illus. $7.50

For many years this title has been one of the most sought for volumes on the study of Shakespeare in the out-of-print book market.

Scholars are familiar with the frequent references to this fine work by other writers but have been unable to obtain copies of the book from any source.

This excellent reprint with its beautiful illustrations will be a delight to Shakespeariana scholars.

Published by

BARNES & NOBLE, Inc.

105 Fifth Ave. New York 3, N. Y.

Shakespearean Riot—1849

The fascinating account of a Shakespearean riot in 1849, as retold by Henry Chafetz, reminds us that international rivalry has often had repercussions outside the realm of pure politics.

In February, 1845, when Edwin Forrest, the foremost American Shakespearean actor, was hissed on the London stage, he accused William Macready, the English tragedian, of instigating the audience. Forrest retaliated by giving Macready a Bronx cheer from the front row during a performance in Edinburgh in March, 1846.

The bad feeling between the actors bore fruit in May of 1849 when Macready, after an American tour, returned to New York for a four-week farewell performance at the Astor Place Theatre. Forrest meanwhile had begun a three-week engagement at the Broadway Theatre not too far distant—and the play was *Macbeth* at both theatres!

The Know-Nothing Party, anti many things as well as foreigners, stirred up anti-Macready feeling especially among the Irish who had special anti-British grievances at the time. Rumors were circulated that Forrest had said Macready should not be allowed on the New York stage. When Manager William Niblo of the Astor Place Theatre noted that more than 1800 tickets had been sold for his 1800 seat house he suspected trouble and requested police protection. After two acts of dodging everything that the "Bowery B'hoys" could throw, Macready gave up. Forrest was naturally accused but denied any connection with the affair.

On May 9th, after a letter signed by Washington Irving and others appeared in the press, Macready consented to act again on May 10th. The pro-Forrest forces considered this a direct challenge! Posters appeared, the Bowery toughs swarmed for tickets, and Mayor Woodhull detailed 300 police to the area and alerted the militia.

The curtain rose and the trouble began. At the end of the first act police arrested the most outstanding of the troublemakers but the trouble continued. Outside, a mob of 20,000 milled around rendering the police ineffectual. The Militia was called and after it sustained 150 casualties fired into the aroused people killing twenty-two and injuring about fifty. Inside, the play continued and ended although no one heard the lines. Macready left the theatre in disguise after thanking his supporters from the stage. The city was in an uproar. Next day six cannon guarded the theatre. The Know-Nothings accused the Mayor of murdering defenseless citizens and eventually fines and prison terms were handed out to the ring-leaders.

Macready embarked from Boston and never returned to America again.

(Adapted from *The Compass* (New York), July 8, 1951, p. 15.)

SHAKESPEARE'S HISTORIES AT STRATFORD 1951

by J. Dover Wilson and T. C. Worsley

The impact and new meaning of the four history plays done as a cycle at Stratford is discussed by Professor Wilson and by the critic of the *New Statesman and Nation,* Mr. Worsley. With an introduction on practical problems of production by Anthony Quayle and 32 pages of photographs by Angus McBean. **$4.50**

SHAKESPEARE MEMORIAL THEATRE 1948-1950

Angus McBean's remarkable photographic record of three important years of Stratford productions, with casts and production notes, and essays by Ivor Brown and Anthony Quayle. **$4.50**

THEATRE ARTS BOOKS

224 West 4th Street New York 14

Romeo & Juliet on Records*

When a good director, Margaret Webster, gets together with an experienced cast headed by Eva Le Gallienne as Juliet, Richard Waring as Romeo, and Dennis King as Meructio, an effective recording can be expected. And when music from Tchaikowsky's Romeo and Juliet Overture is added, the effectiveness is improved, to a point where listening becomes a pleasure. The lines are read with proper emotional intensity and with a clarity that one often misses on the stage. These recordings of great voices will be treasured by future generations.

But with this set as with others that have to be cut to fit the number of sides planned, there are some attendant difficulties. The following comments apply to this and most of the Shakespearean recordings we have heard. Although music is attractively used, some breaks in scenes are followed by a short pause only, and even when music is used, unless the listener is sitting with the text or album in his lap, some confusion is bound to result. Only the most astute Shakespearean will immediately recall the new locale to mind.

If the record is to be used for group entertainment it might be wise to insert an unobtrusive voice to indicate time, place, and speakers before the scenes begin. We would also prefer cutting some of the longer speeches and elimination of some of the shorter ones rather than eliminating some scenes *in toto.* How best to surmount these difficulties is a problem that the recorders must solve before an audience can be completely *en rapport* with the recording. With the proper amount of continuity supplied it would be easy to visualize the play and whole assemblies could enjoy this and other recordings in a manner practically impossible under present conditions.

* The Living Shakespeare Series, Atlantic Recording Corp., 2 records, LP. Playing time two hours, Album ATL-401, $12.95.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer's

JULIUS CAESAR

At a cost of less than $1,500,000 Hollywood hopes that it will turn out a production of *Julius Caesar* that will equal if not surpass the Olivier versions of *Henry V* and *Hamlet.*

Although producer John Houseman and director Joseph L. Mankiewicz worked by phone and mail between New York and Hollywood before they met, surprisingly few liberties have been taken with the text. Some scenes in the third act have been rearranged and the battles merged into a great single conflict, but the dialogue is Shakespeare's.

By cutting rehearsals to three weeks and shooting of the scenes to five weeks, economies of production were possible. The sombreness of the tragedy made the producers decide against Technicolor. However, no expense has been spared in assembling the finest staff and cast possible.

Most famous among the cast is the veteran Shakespearean actor John Gielgud who will portray Cassius, a role which he has taken many times in Stratford. Gielgud came to Hollywood with the laurel of a third Shakespearean record. His recent *Much Ado* broke the record for the play with 225 performances. Last year's *Winter's Tale* and his 1935 *Romeo & Juliet* with Peggy Ashcroft also broke consecutive performance records for those plays. Gielgud has often said that he would never make a Hollywood film but the offer of his favorite role and the faithfulness of the script made him change his mind.

Other stars are Louis Calhern as Caesar, James Mason as Brutus, Marlon Brando as Marc Antony, Deborah Kerr as Portia, and Greer Garson as Calpurnia.

John Houseman has said that the MGM *Julius Caesar* will prove the long known fact of Shakespeare's excellence as a screen writer.

SNL MILLENIUM

To Linwood E. Orange of Augusta, Georgia, who became the 1000th subscriber to *SNL* on August 1 goes a three year gift subscription to the *Newsletter.*

"A JOY TO READ

and own, a book for every library and home, for everyone concerned with the life, times and writings of the greatest of all writers. . . . Students of Shakespearean bibliography and sources will find a wealth of material here, properly indexed and cross-referenced. Altogether this is the ideal 'desert island book' for every lover of Shakespeare, an extraordinary, fascinating and thorough one-volume library."—*Philadelphia Inquirer*

A SHAKESPEARE COMPANION

by F. E. HALLIDAY

742 pages, $8.50

FUNK & WAGNALLS, 153 E. 24th St., N. Y. 10

Review of Periodicals:

TOWARD A REALISTIC SHAKESPEARE

ERIC BENTLEY of Columbia University briefly surveys the history of modern Shakespearean production and offers some penetrating criticism and advice to the new producer and director. Until Shakespeare was freed (by Poel, Granville-Barker, and Monck) from the late Victorian and Edwardian tyranny of actor-managers (Tree, Irving, *et. al.*), Shakespeare was acted in a theatre that was dying of decoration. Ponderous tableaux did away with the Shakespearean succession of scenes, the rhythm of the play, and even the language. Instead of an ensemble of actors they concentrated on the great parts. "The conception was capitalistic, the audience elegant." After Granville-Barker saw a 1913 production of the newly formed Vieux Colombier ensemble and saw its superiority, changes followed more rapidly. Elimination of huge sets eliminated the pauses between scenes, productions became less elegant, Shakespeare more popular, and the popularization has continued. Webster, Evans, and Olivier popularized Shakespeare because their productions were not academic. Shakespeare's text, rhythm, and form have again become evident. But the directors cannot consider all their problems solved. The "revolution" is not over—it is merely a preparation for the future.

II

A negative theory of production in which the director lets Shakespeare speak for himself and merely sees that the actors do not bump into each other is not "modern" or effective. There must be coherence, a point of view. Drama reflects life, and to concern oneself with aesthetic problems while the meaning is left to look after itself, is manifestly incorrect. "The need for a director who has some view of the play as a whole is inexorable." But to err with extreme ideas is also distasteful. One views with misgivings a Hamlet whose only problem is that he loves his mother, an Isabel (*Measure for Measure*) who has a father complex, and a *Julius Caesar* as a war between progressives and reactionaries. Freudian, Marxist, and similar interpretations "are not better than no ideas at all."

III

The solution is that Shakespeare must be made more credible and when Shaw addressed himself to the problem of credibility he knew that "the Shakespeareans would be his arch-enemies; hence his anti-Shakespearean campaign." Producers of Shakespeare should "re-create Shakespeare . . . clear away the fog and give us something intelligible, something credible." It is not sufficient to make the play different by changing the dress to another period. Such bright ideas are not enough. Alec Guinness's Hamlet was a real human being—no "oratory, neuroticism, effeminacy, and movie-star glamour. . . . He was passionate and noble without being either neurotic or genteel." The story was told with a clarity impossible in the Olivier film.

IV

It is in the history plays that we can best begin to see a world as credible as that depicted by Balzac and Tolstoy. Anthony Quayle's production of the Lancastrian tetralogy at Stratford last year revealed the political significance of the plays as it never had been before, although there were some weaknesses. To see the rise and fall of characters on the effectively designed Stratford stage was to convince that the histories should be taken seriously. To make the play more realistic the costuming should be appropriate to the character, and not carnival-like, and the battle scenes not executed as though staged by fencing masters. Care should be taken that no scene becomes merely decorative. *Richard II, I Henry IV, II Henry IV,* and *Henry V,* are, with Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* the great masterpieces of "social realism in English" and the realism should not be destroyed by improper comprehension of the text and its significance.

V

Prof. Bentley offers realism not as a panacea, but as a fundamental under which more serious interpretation of Shakespeare might take place. The simplest, most solid rudiments afford the best starting place for effective production. By asking naive questions of the text and answering them on the stage, the modern producer will "find himself a revolutionary." The American solution does not lie at Britain's coat-tails; reform is needed there too. The Orson Welles productions have been notorious; interpretations were too political, the English was not that of the British Broadcasting System, and the secret of his new film is that Iago loves Othello. But his Elizabethan flamboyance has value. If realism is a solution, perhaps Shakespearean actors should be thrown out and the realists brought in. *Direction must have a point.* If Shakespeare were directed in the same manner as an Arthur Miller play "no one would need a professor to tell him who is the more entertaining author." Importing actors or switching to Arena theatre will not help. Ronald Watkins' *Producing Shakespeare* has demonstrated the effectiveness of Elizabethan staging methods and on such a stage realistic production would be effective. Training of Shakespearean actors for the "realism of regular modern performance" will provide a solution,—"For if Shakespeare is always modern, a modern style—if it is really modern and really a style—will always render his intent better than any archaism." ("The Modern Shakespeare," *The New Republic,* Vol. 126, (In five parts) April 28, pp. 22-3; May 5, pp. 22-3; May 12, pp. 29-30; May 26, pp. 22-3; June 2, pp. 18-19.)

Shakespeare for Our Time

No new tables of contents for a volume explaining *Shakespeare for Our Time* have been received in the *SNL* contest offering a lifetime subscription for the best entry received. Pamphlets and other materials submitted were declared inelligible. ONLY a table of contents is necessary—the book does not have to be written. The contest will be extended to the first 1953 issue.

Shakespeare at Pasadena

Soon after the May *SNL* announced that Sir Frank Benson's Stratford production of the history cycle in 1906 was the only one which preceded the Antioch Festival, we learned that Gilmor Brown had produced the cycle at his Pasadena Playhouse in California in 1935. The ten histories were presented in chronolgical order from July 1 to August 10th, but there was no repertory which permitted viewing each play at successive performances. We have also learned that the cycle was presented from Nov. 7 to Feb. 13 in 1935 by NBC. Vernon Radcliffe directed the adapted plays with a fine cast.

An article on Shakespearean activities at Pasadena will appear in a subsequent issue.

NO WONDER: After Anthony Quayle was awarded the C.B.E. (Commander of the Order of the British Empire), an interview in *The Stratford-upon-Avon Herald* was recorded as follows: Q. What is your hobby, Mr. Quayle? A. The theatre. Q. What do you do in your spare time? A. Go back to the theatre. Q. What books do you read? A. The next play that I shall direct. Q. Have you any aspirations? A. Yes, to be a better actor.

~~Have~~ you renewed your subscription to SNL?

Miscellany

ELIZABETH II: Following the example set by her royal father, Edward VI, and her grandfather, George V, the new Queen has consented to become patron of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre. George V became patron in 1926 to aid the campaign to rebuild the old Memorial Theatre which was destroyed by fire in March of that year. The current theatre was opened on April 23, 1932.

FEMALE HAMLETS: Chris Anderson's plans for a *Hamlet* revival call for a female in the leading role. The production will be called "(Miss) Hamlet." We don't know whether he is seeking a "fat" feminine star (See Leslie Hotson in the Review of Periodicals), but there has been at least one "heavy" one. Clarence Derwent, who this year celebrates his fiftieth year on the stage, recalls that Mrs. Bandmann-Palmer weighed 200 pounds and considered herself just right for *Hamlet.* She acted the part frequently. Sarah Bernhardt and Eva Le Gallienne have also played the part.

BRIEF MENTION: ANTA may produce *The Merchant of Venice* starring Clarence Derwent. . . . The English Regent Park Players will bring a Shakespeare Company here next Fall. . . . Theodora Irvine, author of *A Pronouncing Dictionary of Shakespearean Proper Names,* died on August 16. . . . The beloved and respected former president of the Shakespeare Club of New York, Charles Warburton, died suddenly on July 18th. Mr. Warburton had acted in practically all of Shakespeare's plays.

ENGLISH LITERATURE, RARE BOOKS, ETC.
Catalogues now ready. Free on Request
Carnegie Book Shop
Books, Autographs, Prints
140 East 59th St. New York 22, N. Y.

LECTURES AT THE SHAKESPEARE INSTITUTE–Stratford 1952

E. A. J. Honigmann, Fellow of The Shakespeare Institute

Public lectures at The Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-upon-Avon, began with the opening of the Theatre season, their subjects being the plays currently in production. Mr. Philip Edwards, Mr. E. Honigmann, Mr. G. Shepherd, Dr. D. J. Enright, Mr. G. Lloyd Evans, Dr. R. A. Foakes, Mr. J. R. Brown, Professor Allardyce Nicoll (all of Birmingham University), Mr. David Hardman (formerly Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education), Dr. Clifford Leech (Durham University) and Professor D. J. Gordon (Reading University) all gave lectures on individual plays.

"Shakespeare's Roman Plays"

Dr. Clifford Leech started off the Summer School Public Lectures with a course on "Shakespeare's Roman Plays." The impact of the idea of Rome on the minds of Elizabethans was examined, and the importance of the Roman theme to Jonson, Chapman and Shakespeare in particular. *Titus Andronicus* was appraised as a highly formal pageant, anticipating the later Shakespeare, showing skill in manipulation rather than full experience. *Julius Caesar* was related to the English historical plays, and to the later romantic comedies, through its spread of character-interest, its avoidance of an obvious centre; to *Titus Andronicus* through the formality of its structure. The main theme of *Antony and Cleopatra* is not political but personal, and its analysis of human nature is exact to the point of embarrassment; but *Coriolanus* is largely political, ideas of government being Shakespeare's first concern.

"Comedy, Tragedy, and the Last Plays"

Mr. H. V. D. Dyson (Fellow of Merton College, Oxford), discussing "Comedy, Tragedy, and the Last Plays," was concerned mainly with words, persons and (play-)houses as vehicles of dramatic communication and as symbols within the plays themselves. In the last Summer School Public Lecture, "Tragedy and Christianity," he emphasized that the capacity for suffering, for being damaged, was the measure of spiritual greatness: that Shakespeare's tragic heroes were created to express such greatness, the godhead itself being the archetype of tragedy. In the doctrine of the Trinity, God the Father imposes His will on the Son by giving Him earthly life, the Son's obedience glorifying the Father. The self-giving and self-creating of God are mirrored in tragedy, which portrays eternal begetting, obedience, crucifixion. Tragedy is quasi-sacramental, catering, with its Creation-Destruction patterns, for almost the same spiritual needs as religion.

"The Road to Discovery"

Professor C. J. Sisson (Senior Fellow of the Shakespeare Institute), in his "The Road to Discovery," outlined the many possibilities still open in the study of archives. Since the legal clerks wrote down depositions as they heard them, dialect forms and lost idioms reward those interested in language: while literary historians will still find new facts about the most extensively-studied writers, so rich are the unexplored deposits.

"Hamlet and the Revenge Play"

Professor Kenneth Muir (Liverpool University) showed, in his "*Hamlet* and the Revenge Play," that no single approach will solve the puzzle of Shakespeare's tragedy, the "revenge conventions" being, however, of primary importance. The probable contents of the *Ur-Hamlet* were indicated, but it was argued, against Mr. Eliot, that Shakespeare's mastery of his material was so absolute that it was unwise to credit any parts of his text to the lost play. Elizabethan "revenge ethics" were ambivalent, condemned by the Church, practised in daily life in duels, etc., and Hamlet's dilemma reproduces the two current attitudes. In a sense, Hamlet was an existentialist, his anguish due to his high consciousness of the significance of his choice between the two.

"Shakespeare's Comedy"

Professor Allardyce Nicoll argued that "Shakespeare's Comedy" differed from other types of comedy because it is shot through with tragic significances, and that this is why it does not fit in with the "comic spirit" of Meredith and other theorists. Death enters into his gayest works as a recurring theme. Romance, though important, is not the last word on the subject. The comedies interpret life seriously like the tragedies, each mode containing potentials of the other: they deserve the same close attention, which critical preoccupation with the tragedies has so far denied them.

"Elizabethan Verse and Drama"

Mr. J. R. Brown (Fellow of The Shakespeare Institute) lectured on "Elizabethan Verse and Drama." He examined recent theories of "conventionalized" acting, arguing that though the University actor may have used the same gestures as the trained orator, many early documents showed that the public stage demanded naturalistic acting. The infiltration of pauses and by-play not described by the dialogue, yet essential to the development of the action, indicated that Elizabethan drama gradually relaxed the subordination of gesture to the spoken word. Shakespeare's career spanned the period of this "naturalistic" revolution—which had a parallel also in the visual arts.

"The Vitality of Shakespeare"

Dr. Louis B. Wright (Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library) lectured on "The Vitality of Shakespeare"—on Shakespeare's lasting appeal to remote peoples long after his death. Early American playbills, which drew in their audience with a promise of "moral representations"; Shakespeare's popularity with pioneers and frontiersmen, in whose wake a company of actors frequently followed; advertisements of half a dozen editions of Shakespeare in early nineteenth century American towns, of the "show-boat" productions of a hundred years ago: these and many other signs of vitality, which may be seen in the wonderful Folger collection, intrigued a large audience.

"Shakespeare and This England"

Professor E. P. Kuhl (Iowa University), finally, gave a Shakespeare Institute Public Lecture about "Shakespeare and this England," in which Shakespeare's place in a changing world was underlined. New topicalities in the plays were also pointed out. "Hercules" and "the Moon" often meant Essex and Queen Elizabeth: but besides nicknames there were more recondite forms of allusion. Shakespeare ignored tobacco and the potato because he was no friend of Raleigh. He praised Spanish wines and decried Rhenish because they were Essex and Raleigh monopolies respectively. The *Henry IV* plays were connected with topical investigations into tavern life in the 1590's. The "clock-passage" in the Folio *Richard III* was omitted because of personal friction between Southampton and Buckingham (Villiers), in 1623, about Spanish policy.

coming . . .

SHAKESPEARE AND THE RIVAL TRADITIONS

by

ALFRED HARBAGE

Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions is the winner of the Modern Language Association Macmillan Award for 1951. In this book, Professor Harbage distinguishes between two traditions: that of the "popular play," written by Shakespeare for presentation in the public theatres, and that of the "coterie play," written for the private theatre by Ben Jonson, Middleton and Beaumont and Fletcher. Harbage analyzes the ideas of the Elizabethan age on the divine plan, the nature of love, and social and political institutions. He shows how the popular and the coterie dramatists split into opposite camps in response to audience demand.

publication November 10

$6.50

at your bookstore or write

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 Fifth Ave., N. Y. 11, N. Y.

The Elizabethan Bookseller

Waukegan, Illinois

Monthly Lists of Elizabethan Items

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(The following books may be more extensively reviewed in future issues as space permits.)

Camden, Carroll, THE ELIZABETHAN WOMAN, Houston, The Elsevier Press, 1952, pp. 333, $4.50. (Pub. Sept. 4, 1952.)
For the feminist and the anti-feminist, for the Shakespearean who wants to know the truth about Elizabethan women—their nature, education, marriage, pastimes, clothing, etc.—and the controversies over them, here is a book calculated to answer all questions. The woman who has but two faults (all she says and all she does) is as well depicted as the paragon of virtue. Prof. Camden's extended treatment of Imogen (CF. *SNL*, I:7:30) is not duplicated in this volume but many Shakespearean references occur. The book was beautifully printed and bound in Holland in true Elsevier tradition. Fifty wood-cuts, elaborate footnotes, and an excellent index enhance the value of the volume.

Furness, Alfred, THE SHAKESPEARE COUNTRY, London, Allen & Unwin; N. Y., Macmillan, 1951, pp. 90, $9.50.
These ninety beautiful photographs of Shakespeare's homeland would do Shakespeare's heart good if he could see them in his Parnassian Elysium. They should awaken nostalgia in those who have been to Stratford and inspire pilgrimage in those who have not. A topographical introduction is supplied by H. J. Massingham.

Hogan, Charles Beecher, SHAKESPEARE IN THE THEATRE, Oxford University Press, 1952, pp. xiv, 517, $8.50. (Published Sept. 11, 1952.)
From a diversity of sources Prof. Hogan has assembled a calendar of all performances of Shakespeare on the 18th Century London stage. Dates of all performances and members of the cast are listed not only for the canonical plays but also for all adaptations based on Shakespeare's text. The compiler has not only listed the plays but also has given an outline of the treatment of the Shakespearean play—its excisions, etc.,—or a summary of the adapted play. For the period covered in this volume —1701 to 1750—(a second volume is in preparation), we learn that of the 18,663 plays produced in the period, 3,226 were Shakespeare's. Although not so in actual practice, the three large theatres (Drury Lane, Lincoln's Inn Field, and Covent Garden) gave one Shakespeare play in every six. In 1741 Drury Lane presented Shakespeare 93 times in a total of 191 plays! No explanation of the figure is given, but we recall that Peter Scheemakers' statue of Shakespeare was erected in Westminster Abbey by popular subscription in 1740 and wonder whether this might have affected theatrical managers. Another appendix tells us that *Hamlet* was most popular with 358 performances, *Macbeth* next with 287 (240 were D'Avenant's version), *Othello* third with 265, etc. *Antony and Cleopatra, Love's Labour's Lost,* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* were not acted at all. The tragedies seem to have been twice as popular as the comedies. In general, it is claimed that the many inexpensive editions of the plays published by Tonson and Walker after 1734 created a demand to which the theatres responded. Two indexes (totaling over 50 pages) listing actors and characters provide for effective research.

Hotson, Leslie, SHAKESPEARE'S MOTLEY, Oxford University Press, 1952, pp. ix, 133, $3.50. (Pub. July 24, 1952.)
With characteristic enthusiasm the scholar-detective glibly havocs our common conception of the fool's dress—tight parti-colored hose, parti-colored garments, patched-coat, hood, bells, coxcomb, the *marotte* [sceptre or baulble]—and traces clues from Robert Armin's *Foole upon Foole* (1600) [renamed *A Nest of Ninnies* in 1608] to prove that "motley" was a cloth of mixed color "like homespun or tweed," and that the usual dress of the dramatic fool was the long coat and cap of the idiot fool. "If we ask, what difference does it make? the answer is that our innocent misconception will be seen to have blinded us to the true sense and connotation of several significant passages." The "mothy saddle" of *Shrew* III.2.49 thus becomes "motley saddle," and contemporary evidence of similar phrases is cited. Touchstone, Feste, and the Fool in Lear wore the long motley coat which by its unassuming appearance "gives the player an inestimable advantage" by contrasting deft humor with coarse garb.

Nagler, A. M., SOURCES OF THEATRICAL HISTORY, New York, Theatre Annual, Inc., [1952] pp. xxiii, 611, $7.50.
This well printed volume contains 300 selections and 93 excellent illustrations as an anthology of stage history as distinguished from drama as literary expression. From the first selection "Thespis Meets a Critic" as told by Plutarch to the final selection "Still Wrestling with Chekhov" as told by Stanislavsky, we are treated to a first hand account of stage history told for the most part by those who made it. The Tudor and Stuart Periods are covered in such diversified passages as the Lord Mayor's attack on plays and players, Platter on the price of admission, a premiere at the Fortune theatre, the burning of the Globe, several passages on acting and audiences, Ben Jonson's description of a masque, a description of the costumes and scenery devised by Inigo Jones, etc. Prof. Nagler supplies introductory comments to each selection in the fourteen sections of the book.

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY, edited for The Shakespeare Association of America by James G. McManaway, III:3, pp. 187-295, July, 1952.
The current issue has the usual quota of interesting and important articles and reviews. "Hamlet in Shammy Shoes" by Y. Yoklavich shows that Thomas Sheridan was first to portray Hamlet as "a consistent, studious, irresolute Prince." In "The Two Angry Families of Verona," J. M. Nosworthy proves rather decisively that Porter's *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon* preceded *Romeo & Juliet* and that its influence on Shakespeare was far from beneficial. The value of "The Shakespeare Film as Record" is discussed by R. H. Ball who is certain that if we could find some of the early Shakespearean films, notably those of Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree, stage history would be improved. T. W. Baldwin traces the mould of Nature in "Nature's Moulds," Othello is proved a dramatic Negro rather than a Moor by Philip Butcher, and W. Gordon Zeeveld's paper on the recurrent blood image "Food for Powder"—"Food for Worms," is printed as delivered at the N. Y. Renaissance Club last February. [See abstract *SNL*, II:3, p. 9.] Briefer articles on "The Catholic University *Macbeth*," by Giles E. Dawson, John Fleming on "The Rosenbach-Bodmer Shakespeare Folios and Quartos," reviews, and miscellaneous notes round out the issue.

"The Regeneration of Hamlet"
The *piece de résistance* is S. F. Johnson's article on the "Regeneration of Hamlet." After demonstrating the weaknesses in Tillyard's analysis of *Hamlet* (1950), S. F. Johnson examines the major post-Bradleyan criticisms in terms of their interpretations of the nature of the change in Hamlet's character after the pirates' episode. The crucial speech is that in defiance of augury (V.ii. 230-235) which Johnson explicates in detail in support of the view that Hamlet arrives at a significant recognition of his role a providential agent. The Elizabethan notion that coincidence may represent providential intervention is used to account for the symbolic power of the incidents at sea and of the proposal of the duel immediately after Hamlet resolves to court Laertes' favor. Hamlet's replies to Osric and the attendant Lord make use of his characteristic double-talk, (here by "the common Elizabethan analogy of King with God"), to test the providential purpose of the duel as the means of fulfilling the Ghost's command. Thus his earlier internal conflict between reason and passion is transcended in the attitude that sees his action as in accord with and largely determined by providence as fate, in the Christian-Stoical assumptions that underlie the tragic action.

NEW EDITIONS

ANTONY & CLEOPATRA, London, Folio Society (N. Y., Duschnes), 1952, pp. 134, $3.75.
To the text of "The New Temple Shakespeare" have been added eight brilliantly colored lithographs by Audrey Cruddas and several designs of the settings by Roger Furse from the recent production of the play. Sir Laurence Olivier himself has written an introduction from the actor-manager's viewpoint discussing, among other things, the enigmatic character of Cleopatra. The lavender of the fine binding is repeated for character names in the text. A Glossary and Historical Note on stage history are added for reference.

HAMLET, Boston, Ginn & Co., pp. xx, 298, 60¢.
This is the long famous G. L. Kittredge edition now issued in paper cover at a bargain price. The text is supplemented by 182 pages of notes and comment.

HENRY VI: Part I, Cambridge University Press, 1952, pp. lvi, 222, $2.50. (Pub. in U.S. June 18, 1952.)
John Dover Wilson continues to edit The New Shakespeare in a daring manner. He disagrees with those who have recently returned this play to Shakespeare's pen and gives his own opinions at the beginning of the notes to each scene of the play. Nashe and Greene share the honors for supplying Shakespeare with the basic text, some of which Shakespeare left untouched. Probably, Wilson suggests, Shakespeare was called in to complete Greene's work after the latter had lost face by selling different copies of *Orlando Furioso* to both the Queen's Men and Lord Strange's. Wilson claims to have proved the long suspected belief that Part I was written after Parts II and III. A stage history by C. B. Young and a Glossary augment the voluminous notes and comments to each of the plays in this series.

HENRY VI: Part II, Cambridge University Press, 1952, pp. liv, 221, (plus Genealogical table), $2.50.
Wilson reasserts his belief that pure plagiarism is implied in Greene's attack on Shakespeare and finds Greene the principal author of the play. Verbal parallels, expression, versification, classical allusions, etc., are analyzed to make the finely split attributions of lines.

HENRY VI: Part III, Cambridge University Press, 1952, pp. xlvi, 225, $2.50.
Having discussed the Theatrical and Literary Origins of Parts II and III in the previous volume, Wilson now considers Shakespeare's Early Dramatic Style and The Wars of the Roses in the Chronicles and in these plays. Shakespeare's superiority in the use of metaphor, blank verse, and imagery are stressed. The dust-wrapper of each volume tells us that the question of authorship is important "for the biographical issues involved, and still more for the aesthetic ones, inasmuch as our whole conception of the nature of Shakespeare's poetic genius turns upon it."

JULIUS CAESAR, New York, Globe Book Co., 1952, pp. viii, 99, $1.56.
The text is edited and adapted by Jack A. Wapen and Leroy S. Layton for High School use. Obsolete words and expressions have been modernized, obscure passages deleted, others clarified, and punctuation added. Scenes 2 and 3 of Act IV have been combined and Scene 2 of Act V (which consists of only six lines) has been omitted. The text is illustrated with 11 photographs from a Bob Jones University production of the play.

MACBETH, London, Folio Society (N. Y., Duschnes), 1951, pp. 111, $3.75.
Another of the beautiful Folio Society editions, this one bound in deep red with red used also for character names in the text. Eight haunting lithographs by Michael Ayrton for a potential production of the play stress a grey motif. The artist writes also that to him *A & C* is a "gold play" and *The Tempest* a "pale green one." Sir Lewis Casson's Introduction utilizes wide experience as actor and producer. As an actor who knows that he is working on a "cut" play he is able to say that the present text may "well represent what the audience actually heard better than the author's original scripts." Among other interesting comments, he declares that Laurence Housman once suggested that in V:3 Lady Macbeth should enter "aloft" as the men arm and silently take a sword in the general confusion. This would make clear Lady Macbeth's ending.

ROMEO & JULIET, London, Folio Society (New York, Duschnes), 1950, pp. 131, $3.75.
Bound in a brighter red than the *Macbeth* and similarly printed, the beauty of this volume is enhanced by a printed plastic dust-wrapper. Designs and a dozen colorful lithographs by Jean Hugo (which were made for Jean Cocteau's French adaptation of the play) enhance the appearance of the book. Nevil Coghill's Introduction is concerned mainly with the poetic sources of the play. Chaucer is especially emphasized. As in the other Folio Society editions, a Glossary is added for reference.

Who is Shakespeare? What is He?

A. Bronson Feldman

William Shakespeare is a pen-name, a *nom de guerre*, adopted by an English aristocrat who, for strong reasons hinted at in his *Sonnets*, concealed his identity as a dramatist behind the blank business face of William Shakspere of Stratford-on-Avon. The aristocrat—in the opinion of European and American researchers of high classical and scientific training—was Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford (1550-1604). We know (from contemporary testimony of Harvey, Webbe, and Meres) that Oxford was the chief of Elizabethan courtier poets, and a dramatist of great merit, though none of his plays survives under his real name.

Oxford and the Drama

Oxford's lifelong interest in the stage expressed itself in patronage of several companies of players, including, as I have proved elsewhere, the Lord Chamberlain's troupe to which Shakspere belonged and for whom Shakespeare wrote. De Vere's title of Lord Great Chamberlain of England probably suggested his taking the place of the Queen's Lord Chamberlain as director of her court theater, especially since the other Chamberlains were not deeply attracted by such work. He himself acted in at least one court masque. His biographer, B. Ward, has demonstrated the Earl's genius for masquerade, particularly his repute for wit and comedy, while showing that his life was actually tragic. He had to hide from royal fury, court disgrace, and creditors. But he also loved mystery, and knew how to plot without getting caught. The story of his life provided the inspiration for Shakespeare's choice of plots for plays. On the basis of this fact Sigmund Freud seems to have decided that Oxford was Shakespeare.

Oxford began writing plays in 1576, after his return from travel in France, Germany, and Italy. He suddenly separated from his wife, and wrote *The Comedy of Errors* to account for the divorce. *Pericles* was his fantasy-contribution to their reunion, which did not last long or peacefully. He fell in love with Anne Vavasor (the Dark Lady of his Sonnets) and precipitated a feud which A. Feuillerat recognized as similar to the feud of *Romeo and Juliet*. Lord Burghley, his father-in-law (whom even orthodox scholarship identifies as the original Polonius), reconciled him again to marriage, and tradition makes the event comparable to the scandal stuff in *All's Well That Ends Well* and *Measure for Measure*. *Hamlet* and *Othello* are even more autobiographic. *King Lear* is a dreamlike presentation of problems of Oxford and his three daughters and his two sons, one illegitimate. He wrote the tragedy in his last home, King's Place, within walking distance of the London playhouses he loved.

The dedication to *Venus and Adonis* indicates that the name of Shakespeare is an invention, as clearly as the pun-master who wrote it could tell the world. This explains the hyphen in the title page of *Shake-speare's Sonnets* and the first quartos.

Courtier, soldier, scholar (and melancholiest of lovers), Edward de Vere was the first force in the Renascence of the English theater. When he died in 1604 the theater declined, and the plays of Shakespeare that were staged were old (as Ben Jonson informs us). Not one of Shakespeare's works has been dated after 1604 except on flimsiest testimony. They all belong to the lifetime of Oxford, historically, artistically, psychologically.

(Dr. Feldman received his Ph.D. in Tudor Drama at the U. of Pa., has taught at various universities and is now a historical archivist in Philadelphia. His work on Shakespeare (The Earl of Oxford) is widely published.)

*SHAKESPEARE'S IDENTITY**

In *Shakespeare's Identity* A. W. Titherley has given us a volume crammed with fact, analysis, opinion and comment "proving" more decisively than did J. T. Looney in 1920 that William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby, was William Shakespeare. His dates, 1560?-1642, seemingly make him a better candidate than the Earl of Oxford (his father-in-law) who died in 1604, and his poetic and dramatic ability make him a better candidate than Sir Francis Bacon. The uninitiated might well be overwhelmed by the evidence, but the informed Shakespearean will say that Dr. Titherley is right from his point of view but that his point of view is probably wrong.

That the author's name was William, that he was a patriot, that he had wisdom, and that he knew the Welsh is admissable, but to insist that the author of the plays *had* to be "intimate with the English and foreign courts," that "He had motives for concealing his identity," that "He had travelled extensively abroad," that he could read French, Latin, and Italian, that "He was deeply versed in ancient classical lore and renaissance literature," and that he had intricate specialized knowledge of law, music, statesmanship, etc., is hardly warranted by the evidence of the plays. What Shakespeare knew was readily available from cosmopolitan London, from books, from associates, from sources, and from a poetically receptive mind.

Shakspere *vs.* Shakespeare

Titherley, like other unorthodox Shakespeareans, believes that there was a *Shakspere* who was an actor and that *Shakespeare* so spelled was a pseudonym for the author of the plays who had to hide his identity for aristocratic and political reasons. The penny-pinching Shakspere would not have stood aristocratically by to see his plays pirated and others deriving the profits. It is indeed a tribute to the Bard that most contenders who have been brought forward have been well-educated knights or members of the nobility. Titherley insists that it is inconceivable that a plebeian could have written the plays and to say that Shakspere wrote *Hamlet* is "a sin against reason."

But Titherley's arguments are not to be passed over lightly. His wide background throws light on many interesting aspects of Shakespeareana. He fears neither Baconian nor Oxfordian and treats both decisively. This reviewer is not qualified to pass judgment on the complicated analysis of orthographic peculiarities but Titherley feels his point proved even to Derby's handwriting in the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More*.

If existing biographies of Shakespeare do contain many if's, perhap's, and maybe's, the argument against this volume is that it contains many more. Conjecture is rampant. We note with consternation that evidence formerly used in favor of Bacon and Oxford is now manipulated to favor Derby.

The great conspiracy of Elizabethans and Jacobeans to hide the Bard's identity, if true, should be considered another wonder of the world. We, at least, are grateful for the plays themselves.

* Winchester, The Wykeham Press, 1952, pp. xi, 337, nine plates and genealogical table, $4.50.

The Bacon-Shakespeare Question

Stewart Robb

Ivor Brown, in *The Amazing Monument*, has made some remarkable admissions: "On the positive side Baconians can justly claim that their hero was over and over again described as a poet. His friend Tobie Matthew wrote to him: 'The most prodigious wit that ever I knew, of my nation and this side the sea, is of your Lordship's name, though he here be known by another.' Aubrey called Bacon 'a good poet, but concealed, as appears by his letters.' Stow (1615) included Bacon among our 'modern and excellent poets,' and Davies of Hereford talked of 'his Muse.' There are many posthumous allusions to his muse, even to his buskin. It is natural to suppose from all this that Bacon wrote much verse and some drama, especially in his years of small employment." Elsewhere Ivor Brown goes so far as to admit that Bacon probably wrote *Love's Labour's Lost* and that Shakespeare was called in only as a play-doctor. Yet Brown is a Stratfordian!

Bacon a Poet

Shortly after Bacon's death (1626) a volume of Latin verse, entitled *Manes Verulamiani* was published, in which twenty-seven scholars praise the philosopher as the greatest poet of all time and as the greatest writer of tragedies and comedies that ever lived. These men were not mad, so explain this astonishing fact, if you please.

Venus and Adonis (1593), the first poem to appear with Shakespeare's name, was quickly condemned by Bishop Hall, in a satire, as a licentious poem written by a man who raised an inky cuttlefish cloud around him, coward-like hiding his authorship under another's name. Marston, a satirist feuding with Hall, defended the author, saying, as if shocked, "What! not *Mediocria Firma* from your spite!" The motto, *Mediocria Firma*, was the exclusive possession of Bacon and his family. (*Venus and Adonis*, although a "risky" poem, found no difficulty receiving its imprimatur from the Archbishop of Canterbury, Francis Bacon's tutor.)

The first printed praise we know of that names the name of Shakespeare, *Polimanteia*, put out by Cambridge University in 1595, extols the Bard as a University graduate. He is identified as the author of *Venus and Adonis* and the *Rape of Lucrece*, so no other man of the same name is meant. The actor "Will" never went to Cambridge, but Bacon did. Cambridge men who are authorities on the Bard have been puzzled at the use of Cambridge terms in the plays, also at the satiric portrait of Dr. Caius, a Cambridge professor known personally to the young Bacon. Also, a Latin comedy, *Laelia*, which was performed in Latin at the University, and kept in manuscript in the institution, is known to be source-material for *Twelfth Night*.

Bacon had mastery of the diversified styles necessary to produce the plays of the "myriad-minded" Shakespeare. His biographer Mallet says: "In his conversation he would assume the most different characters, and speak the language proper to each with a facility that was perfectly natural; for the dexterity of the habit concealed every appearance of art." His friend Osborne says: "I have heard him entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs; and at another time out-cant a London chirurgeon."

These are only an infinitesimal few of the facts indicating the identity of the true Shakespeare.

(Mr. Robb, now organizing a Bacon-Shakespeare Society in N.Y.C., holds English and Canadian M.A.'s and is well known in Baconian circles where he has published often.)

REVIEW *of* PERIODICALS

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Ned B. Allen, U. of Delaware; S. F. Johnson, N.Y.U.; Arthur Sherbo, U. of Illinois.

THE PROBLEM COMEDIES AGAIN

VIRGIL K. WHITAKER advances the very plausible suggestion that the "confusion of effect" which marks *Troilus and Cressida* and *Measure for Measure* is the result of Shakespeare's attempt to apply "to comedy the same fund of ideas and the same philosophic analysis of human action" used in the mature tragedies. Unfortunately, the romance material of his sources resisted this kind of "close intellectual analysis." Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* is the chief source of the philosophical ideas in *Troilus and Cressida;* fundamental Christian doctrines, of *Measure for Measure.* The philosophical basis of *Troilus and Cressida*—the idea of order and that of reason versus an affected will—and the causation of events, springing from the "operation of the laws of nature," implicit in them are too weighty for the play. The reconciliation of ideas of absolute justice and absolute mercy in *Measure for Measure,* possible under Christian doctrine, conflicts with plot elements which stem from the romance materials of the source and from the folk situations added by Shakespeare. Only extensive realignment of plot source materials with the controlling philosophic purpose could redeem these plays from confusion. ("Philosophy and Romance in Shakespeare's 'Problem' Comedies," in *The Seventeenth Century* . . . by R. F. Jones and others, Stanford, 1951.

RECURRENT IMAGERY IN *OTHELLO*

Images of black and white (or fair), and certain extensions of this basic antithesis—hell and heaven, dark and light, and foul and pure—are so prevalent in *Othello* that R. B. HEILMAN of the University of Washington finds in them an important clue to the structure and meaning of the play. From Iago's "an old black ram/Is tupping your white ewe" (I. 1. 88-9) to Othello's "Put out the light, and then put out the light" speech (V. 2. 7-13) the tragedy is not only full of verbal images centering about the black-white (etc.) antithesis, but also of night scenes with characters entering with torches. Thus the verbal, or poetic, structure is supported by settings and actions, the darkness of the night scenes with the light of the torches being, of course, a visual extension of the black-white (dark-light) imagery. There are a number of interesting ramifications: Iago seeks to make black and white (etc.) indistinguishable; Othello's physical blackness is pronounced "more fair than black" (I. 3. 291) and becomes doubly black and foul as the play draws to an end (with the final possibility of his return to "fairness" as he begins to distinguish between light and dark); and the alternative of night as a setting for married love, slightly developed, affords a fine irony when joined with the full development of night as a time of chaos, rioting, and brawls. ("More Fair Than Black: Light and Dark in *Othello,*" *Essays in Criticism,* October, 1951, pp. 315-35.)

SHAKESPEARE NOT OSTRACIZED

When on March 9, 1618, William Harrison, the Catholic archpriest in London, issued a proclamation wherein secular priests were forbidden to attend public theatres, it caused a protest, written by Fr. Thomas Leke, which revealed that although "the number of clerical playgoers could not have been large . . . it was probably larger than Fr. Colleton [author of the rejoinder] was willing to admit." Monsignor I. J. SEMPER of Loras College shows that Fr. Colleton's chief answers to Fr. Leke's objection to the restriction were that the plays were *not* the "type designated as lawful by St. Thomas Aquinas," that "professional actors are reputed infamous" even by English law, that attendance by priests at plays is the cause of scandal and bad example, etc. However, Msgr. Semper points out that although many plays had wicked plot-devices, and "realistic portrayals of evil," many, notably those of Shakespeare, "arouse our moral condemnation for the characters who use these devices." In individual passages Shakespeare "displays a distinct fondness for Catholicism." Offensive matter is for low elements in the audience, and is introduced in pun form, *not* as action in the play. "In the light of the controversy we must now pronounce the view that Catholics, like Puritans, ostracized the playhouses of Elizabeth and James as untenable." ("Jacobean Playhouses and Catholic Clerics," *The Month,* VIII:1, July, 1952, pp. 28-39.)

"ALL THE WORLD'S A STAGE"

LEONARD F. DEAN of the University of Connecticut examines the functions of metaphors of the state as theater in *Richard II.* His perspectives are the traditional view of the world as stage on the one hand and the theatricalism of politics on the other, with their respective implicit philosophies of Christian humanism (More) and Renaissance Realpolitik (Machiavelli). For example, Richard's speech in prison is, among other things, "a dramatic analysis of the moral dilemma in the theater-like state" where political appearance and reality are at odds; whereas Henry IV's death speech—"all my reign hath been but as a scene/ Acting that argument"—prophesies his son's miraculous resolution of the dualism in the healthy state depicted in *Henry V,* the last play of the tetralogy. ("*Richard II*: The State and the Image of the Theater," *PMLA,* LXVII: 2, pp. 211-218, March, 1952.)

SHAKESPEARE'S IDENTITY

BY

A. W. Titherley

D.SC., PH.D. and Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts

The vexed question that has so long disturbed many thoughtful minds, whether the poet Shakespeare really was the uncultured stage player William Shakspere as commonly believed, or whether the latter has been confused with some unknown mighty genius concealing himself behind a nom-de-plume, is the subject of critical enquiry in this book. An attempt has been made to solve the great problem by calling in aid of literary and historical evidence, the less fallible procedure of scientific and calligraphic analysis. The research, proving decisive, over-rides the hesitations of the past, for it is shown beyond reasonable doubt that the name Shakespeare was the adopted pen-name of William Stanley; and the new disclosures must appeal to all who are not wedded to pre-conceived theory.

Copyright in U.S.A. 1952

348 pages — Large Octavo; and 9 plates

Price $4.50

To be obtained from The British Book Centre Inc., 122 East 55th Street, New York 22; from the publishers, Warren & Son, Ltd., The Wykeham Press, Winchester, England; or from Wm. Dawson & Sons, Cannon House, 10, Macklin Street, London, W.C. 2.

FULL-FED HAMLET

Although most readers have abandoned the idea that Hamlet was actually corpulant ("fat and scant of breath"), says LESLIE HOTSON, the "dubious meaning 'sweaty' which has been eagerly offered as a substitute is little better." Kittredge's suggestion that *fat* could be taken to mean "rather soft . . . not quite trained down," is attractive, but Hamlet has indicated that "he has been *in continual practice.*" Dr. Hotson proposes "full-*fed* or *replete*" as the actual meaning and cites contemporary references in which "fat" has this sense. A grim parallel is revealed when we realize that Hamlet senior was also murdered during an after dinner nap "grossly full of bread," with no shriving time allowed. ("Hamlet Fat?", *The* (London) *Spectator,* May 30, 1952.

Preserve SNL; an annual Index is issued

A PROBLEM IN GOVERNMENT

The Vienna of *Measure for Measure* is held up to the London of Shakespeare's day as a lesson in government; "the Duke is a figure of Shakespeare himself"; and the entire play is best understood as both philosophy (in the literal sense of "love of wisdom") and "poetry-of-the-theatre." These are some of the points made by FRANCIS FERGUSSON of Princeton University in a provocative analysis of *Measure for Measure* which combines the insight of the critic with the more practical knowledge of the man of the theatre. The Duke's double function as a character in the play and as "a sort of stage-director" is discussed. In both roles the Duke's main purpose is to read a lecture in government. For about half the play Lucio, representing an almost diabolical love of chaos, acts as a foil for the disguised ruler and is, significantly, the only character the Duke cannot really forgive. The end of the drama is a *quod est demonstrandum* of the philosophical (and political) thought as well as of the poetic play. ("Philosophy and Theatre in *Measure for Measure,*" *Kenyon Review,* Winter, 1952, pp. 103-20.)

SHAKESPEARE'S "FESTIVE" COMEDIES

C. L. BARBER discovers that Shakespeare's gay comedies have an "underlying configuration" deriving from the ritualistic aspect of English holidays. Adopting the formula, *through release to clarification,* Mr. Barber suggests that the atmosphere of the plays resembles that of a "revel" which affords a feeling of "release" (freedom from inhibition). This "release" makes for a stronger awareness of the relation between man and "nature"—in short, *clarification.* The saturnalian aspect of some of the early plays is best seen in such "clowns" as Jack Cade and Falstaff, both of whom represent "anarchy by clowning." Indeed, the latter, (and here the writer avowedly has recourse to modern terminology), is somewhat analogous to the "scapegoat" of primitive ritual. ("The Saturnalian Pattern in Shakespeare's Comedy," *Sewanee Review,* LIX, pp. 593-611, October, 1951.)

HAMLET AS WASTELAND

His need to locate Hamlet's tragic flaw leads ROY W. BATTENHOUSE of Indiana University to examine the "Psalm-to-Man," "What a piece of work is a man" (II.ii.315 ff.). He finds that, "measured by the theory of Aquinas, Hamlet is a man deprived of the light of grace" and that his use of the word "grace" is not "satisfactory to a Christian ear." Therefore Battenhouse challenges the view of the "Tillyard-Semper school" that Hamlet is a sound Thomist. Yet Battenhouse uses the Thomistic theology as the standard by which to judge, assuming that Shakespeare like T. S. Eliot ordered his materials by the light of the Catholic-Christian tradition. Thus he finds that *Hamlet* is the "Tragedy of Unbaptized Man," that it embodies Shakespeare's vision of the pitiable outcome of Renaissance Man's "effort to cope with the problem of evil when unaided by Christian resources and assumptions." The play, then, is the Catholic-Christian Shakespeare's "meaningful interpretation" of the faddish Revenge-play, an interpretation which, "by a hidden logic based on a Christian understanding," reveals the Wasteland implications of such a "sub-Christian" story-action. ("Hamlet's Apostrophe on Man: Clue to the Tragedy," *PMLA,* LXVI:6, pp. 1073-1113, Dec., 1951.)